

hood. We seem to have here a bunch of shifty politicians who talk one thing before election and something entirely different afterward. That their double dealing forced an indignant protest from Mr. Bryan is a fact that history will always treasure to his credit and to their disgrace.—Terre Haute (Ind.) Star.

BRYAN IS RIGHT

Of course Mr. Bryan is right in his demand for free wool. It is an indefensible outrage upon our ninety millions of people to compel them to pay higher prices for their short wool and shoddy clothing than the people of England pay for their long wool clothing, merely to give a few hundred sheep raisers a theoretical increase of profit at their expense, on the wool produce in this country. We say theoretical profit, because, while the sheep raisers are allowed to charge higher prices for their inferior wool, the owners of the sheep pastures increase their ground rents to absorb the increase of profit in the wool and the poor deduced, though "protected," sheep raisers are as badly off as they were before. Besides, the short wool clothing stretches and becomes baggy and ill fitting in four or five months, while the long staple woolen materials which the tariff on the raw materials prevents us from manufacturing here, wear for years without becoming unshapely.

Of course, we realize that Mr. Underwood is in rather a delicate position in the matter, because the great steel and iron producing and manufacturing interests of his state (Alabama) require a high protective tariff on their commodities, to enable them to pay high wages to their unorganized negro laborers, and the votes of the sheep men are needed to maintain the protective system; but he should realize that it is better for a protectionist to vindicate his principles by staying at home as a republican, than to come to congress as a democrat and there support republican policies.

Mr. Underwood's retort, that Mr. Bryan voted for the Wilson bill containing the same wool schedule which he presents, is a non-sequitur; all democrats, except the pro-tariff filibusters, voted for the Wilson bill on its final passage, as it is to be hoped, all democrats will vote for the Underwood bill, on its final passage, however earnestly they may, in the meantime, urge the amendment of some of its schedules.

Again, it will be well for some of our leading democrats to remember that Mr. Bryan has a right to be heard, even in criticism of the august "ways and means committee;" and also that democratic leaders who seriously disagree with Mr. Bryan's well-known views on the tariff question are likely to find themselves without support or following, in the near future.—San Francisco Star.

FREE RAW MATERIALS

Mr. Bryan's powerful and impressive warning against any concession to a protective tariff on wool, derives double force from the fact that the country from Maine to Georgia and from the east to the far west put itself on record last fall against a tariff on raw materials. Mr. Underwood says in effect that the wool schedules proposed in the house are not what Mr. Bryan thinks them, and we hope Mr. Underwood is right in his belief that the schedules do not recede from the free raw material principle. They should confirm and emphasize that principle.—Buffalo (N. Y.) Times.

NECESSARIES AND LUXURIES

Mr. Warburton of Washington, one of the new republican insurgents in the house, scoffs at the Underwood contention that the wool tax was needed for revenue. "If the government would put a reasonable tax on tobacco, which may be considered a luxury," said Mr. Warburton, attacking the Underwood bill on the floor, "it would let in woolen goods, cotton goods and sugar without any tariff whatever. If this country taxed tobacco as England or France does, we could close the doors of all the customs houses except as to the importation of liquors and tobaccos." Going further, he said:

"The American people are paying six times as much to the government on sugar as they are on 5-cent cigars, 12 times as much on sugar as on 10-cent cigars, 30 times as much on sugar as on 25-cent cigars and 60 times as much on sugar as on 50-cent cigars. The rich man who smokes a 35-cent cigar pays 1/2 cent tax on each dollar's worth of them, while his gardener, who smokes 5-cent cigars, pays 6 cents tax on his dollar's worth, and his washerwoman who

buys a dollar's worth of sugar pays 36 cents tax on it."

This discrimination in favor of the rich is not exceptional; it is the rule. All the way through the Taft-Aldrich schedules, as all through the Dingley schedules and all through the McKinley schedules, the same injustice runs. The high rates of duty are always on those articles which are consumed by the poor; the low rates are always on those articles which are consumed by the rich, the duty on Mrs. Astor's diamonds being 15 per cent as against 100 per cent on the cotton hostery worn by the Astor chambermaid.—Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat.

POPULAR GOVERNMENT

The following letter is self-explanatory: Lincoln, Neb., June 9, 1911.—Mr. Frank Wright Burr, New York, N. Y. My Dear Sir: The answer to the World's editorial is not difficult to find if one believes in popular government. The argument made by the World attacks the theory of popular government. It seems to draw a distinction between popular government and constitutional government. As a matter of fact constitutions are made by the people and always set forth methods by which they can be amended, and the tendency is to make the amendment of constitutions easier than it used to be. The initiative and referendum is an amendment to the constitution, and so is the recall. The people can not have the initiative and referendum unless they vote for it, neither can they have the recall unless they want it, and they can abandon the recall whenever they get tired of it just as they can the initiative and referendum.

Judges have no power except as that power is conferred by the law or by the constitution, and the people who make the laws and who make the constitutions have the power to prescribe and limit the jurisdiction of judges. The idea that the liberties of the people are not safe in the hands of the people is abhorrent to those who believe in popular government. The objection to the recall of judges is based on the theory that the judge is regarded different from other officials. If that be true, would that not protect a judge against an unjust use of the recall?

If the World insists upon sufficient time for deliberation and regulations which will insure deliberation, it will be able to defend its position, for no one desires to have an official removed in a gust of passion, but when the World attacks the right of the people to recall an official, it disregards the theory upon which our government is built, namely, that the official is the servant of the people and is useful only as he reflects their wishes. Very truly yours, W. J. BRYAN.

IN INDIANA

An Indianapolis dispatch to the Cincinnati Enquirer, says: "The Indiana delegation to the next democratic national convention will be instructed to vote for Governor Marshall for the nomination for president."

The foregoing statement was made by William H. O'Brien, state auditor, in a manner that carried conviction. O'Brien is an acknowledged leader of the party and is in close touch with what is being done by the democracy of Indiana.

"There will be no doubt about Indiana being for Governor Marshall for the nomination," said O'Brien. "He may not be nominated, but his state delegation will vote for him, not only on the first ballot, but on every other ballot."

O'Brien said that the question of second choice will not be considered for the reason that the delegation will be chosen to stick to Governor Marshall from start to finish. He said that there is practically no doubt but that this plan will be adopted.

CULTIVATING THE APPETITE

A reader of The Commoner sends in the following letter from an employe:

"Dear Sir: I deem it my duty to write you a few lines, that I am going away to the country on a farm; away from temptation, and where no drink is sold. I have tried and tried to stop drinking. I never was like I am now. Years ago when I built the Solar oil works in this city, I was a very sober man, and took care of my people. I know drink has got a hold on me and I think by going away in the country I will learn to forget it and make a man of myself again."

And yet there are many who think that it is "legitimate business" to cultivate the appetite for drink. Is not this hatred of brother?

THE NEW SHERMAN ACT
Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in (unreasonable) restraint of trade or commerce among the several states, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding five thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.—From Literary Digest.

BREATHE IT IN, WOODROW!

Woodrow Wilson left the far east opposed to recall of the judiciary. He got as far west as Denver, when he said: "I would not say that I am absolutely against recall of judges. I would rather say that I am unconverted to the principle."

"While the lamp holds out to burn, the—but, we'll put it in a more respectful way by saying that we're mighty glad to see Woodrow 'on the mourners' bench,' willing to absorb the truth and evidently not at all sure that he hasn't been a great sinner in respect of that recall."

Mr. Wilson, you have come from the other, the older side of the nation, where there is pretty unanimous worship of property, where the hoary old age of antiquated precept and precedent and principle gets respect no matter how many fleas there are in its whiskers, where millions vote for party simply because it is party, where even able men don't always trust in the people.

You come out here into the west into a different atmosphere. Our great plains, our towering mountains, our mighty rivers, even our vast deserts teach enterprise, courage, freedom, self-reliance, fearlessness of purpose and love of country, because it is our country.

You come where men have conquered the worst that nature had to offer and have learned to do and to dare, men who lynch a wrong when they find it as thoroughly as their ancestors lynched a scoundrel in '49. Cowardice, subservience to political fakirs, worship of judicial dignity and other evil disguises don't cut much figure in our atmosphere, Woodrow, and we sure want you to breathe into your very soul a whole lot of the man-making, nation-lifting oxygen of our environment.

Woodrow, the bigness of our great west breeds bigness of heart, bigness of purpose. Take it in. Inhale it. Give your New Jersey lungs full play!—Wichita (Kan.) Beacon.

CONCENTRATED CONTROL OF WEALTH

Speaking at Harrisburg, Pa., in a gathering of democrats, Governor Woodrow Wilson, of New Jersey, said:

"The plain fact is that the control of credit is dangerously concentrated in this country. The money resources of the country are not at the command of those who do not submit to the direction and domination of small groups of capitalists who wish to keep the economic development of the country under their own eye and guidance. The great monopoly in this country is the money monopoly. So long as that exists our old variety and freedom and individual energy of development are out of the question. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities, are in the hands of a few men, even if their actions be honest and intended for the public interest, are necessarily concentrated on the great undertakings in which their money is involved and who necessarily, by every reason of their own limitations, chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedom. This is the greatest question of all and to this statesmen must address themselves with an earnest determination to serve the long future and the true liberties of men."

The American Homestead, a monthly farm journal of national scope, will be sent to all Commoner subscribers who renew their subscriptions during the month of June at regular rates, if this noticed is mentioned when writing.